



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,200	03/30/2007	Jurgen Dorn	568-pdd-03-14 US	2020
79990	7590	11/09/2009		
C. R. Bard, Inc. Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. 1415 W. 3rd Street P.O. Box 1740 Tempe, AZ 85280-1740			EXAMINER MENDOZA, MICHAEL G	
			ART UNIT 3734	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/09/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/580,200

Applicant(s)

DORN, JURGE

Examiner

MICHAEL G. MENDOZA

Art Unit

3734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/30/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The applicant argues that St.Germain does not teach a shaft that extends from a proximal end to a distal end. The examiner disagrees. The device of St. Germain taken as a whole makes up a shaft. It is clearly seen in figs. 1-5 that the shaft has a proximal and distal end.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102


3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-15, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by St. Germain et al. 5534007 (St. Germain).
5. St. Germain teaches a catheter device comprising: a shaft (15), a medical implant (35), a guidewire (20), a flushing lumen, a proximal guidewire exit port (see fig. 8); a sheath (40) that lies radially outside the medical implant in the catheter that is proximally withdrawn from the medical implant, a first shaft element including at least one of a pull wire (45) and a rod to pull the sheath proximally; and a second shaft element including a pusher tube (155), wherein the sheath comprises a tapered distal tip (25), wherein the pull wire (45) is coupled to the sheath by an inner pull ring (55)

located radially inside the sheath (40), the pull wire and pull ring being both of metal and with a metal bond between the pull wire and the pull ring (col. 4, lines 24-33), wherein the sheath is polymeric and carries within its wall thickness a braid of metallic filaments (col. 3, lines 39-42), wherein the pusher tube comprises a distal end to which is fix side-by-side, the proximal end of a pusher-guider tube the defines a lumen for the guidewire (see figs. 6-8); wherein the pusher-guider tube comprises a spiral metal filament (col. 3, lines 8-17) that carries a stopper ring (60), wherein the second shaft element include the pusher tube, the pusher-guider tube and the stopper ring (see figs. 6-8), a flushing sleeve (50) that is contiguous with the sheath and defines a lumen that contains the pusher tube (see figs.), a guider block (100) that has a cylindrical outside surface to receive the flushing sleeve, a guidewire lumen, and a lumen side-by-side with the guidewire lumen to receive the pusher tube (figs. 1-5), the flushing sleeve distal of the guider-block includes a bellows tube (see compression of 50 in figs. 1-3), wherein the flushing sleeve distal of the guider block includes a telescopic tube (see compression of 50 in figs. 1-3), wherein the guide block is fixed against axial movement, wherein the proximal guidewire exit port (120 can also be used as a guidewire exit port) is immediately proximal of the guider block, wherein the medical implant devices comprises one of a self-expanding stent (35), a stent, a stent graph, and a filter.



Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Germain et al.

8. As to claim 4, St. Germain teaches the claimed invention except for an outer puller ring. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use more than one puller ring, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

9. As to claim 9, St. Germain teaches the claimed invention except for wherein the pusher tube and the pusher guide tube are separate and held side-by-side by an adaptor block. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to make the pusher tube and pusher guide tube separate, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179. And furthermore, parts 140, 60, or 25 are capable of acting as an adaptor block.

10. As to claims 16, St. Germain teaches the claimed invention except for the claimed length of around 75 cm. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed length, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

11. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Germain et al. in view of Sullivan et al. 6514196.

12. St. Germain teaches the catheter as claimed in claim 15. It should be noted that St. Germain fails to teach a steering tube.

13. Sullivan teaches a catheter that is combined with a common steering tube (col. 5, lines 5-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the catheter of St. Germain in view of Sullivan to help steer, push, or twist the device to a desired location.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL G. MENDOZA whose telephone number is (571)272-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Manahan can be reached on (571) 272-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. G. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3734

/Todd E Manahan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3734